

A

FEW WORDS

IN SUPPORT OF No. 90

OF THE

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,

PARTLY WITH REFERENCE TO

MR. WILSON'S LETTER.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1841.

A
FEW WORDS,
&c.

ACQUIESCING as I do in the general principles advocated in Tract XC, and deeply grateful to its author for bringing forward in it a view of our formularies, full of comfort to myself and many others with whom I am acquainted, I am induced to say a few words with regard to Mr. Wilson's recently published Letter; not as being unmindful of the great evils to which direct theological controversy, unless great care be used on both sides, is apt to lead, but still considering that in the present case a view of part of our Articles, new in great measure at least to the present generation, will hardly meet with general acceptance till after full and fair discussion, and that those who feel difficulties in that view have a fair claim on those who advocate it that their objections shall at least be considered. I should not do justice to my own feelings if I did not add, that another reason which

would less disincline one to controversy on the present occasion than on most others, is the most remarkably temperate and Christian tone of the paper to which Mr. Wilson was a party, and which began the contest: a tone which may well encourage in us sanguine hopes, that the beginning having been made in such a spirit, whatever may be said on either side may be said on the whole in a temper not unworthy of the grave importance of the subject.

Mr. Wilson begins with considering the use of the word 'authoritative teaching' in the Letter of the Four Tutors. On this point I do not deny that Mr. Newman seems to have misunderstood them, but still they also appear first to have misunderstood him. I think the Tract *did* imply, that on the points mentioned in their Letter, the Articles do not condemn the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that in point of fact there is no *necessity* for any Roman Catholic either then or at the present day to hold on these points opinions which the Articles condemn. And this view of what the Tract implied is made certain by the following passage of Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, 'The simple question is, whether taken by themselves in their mere letter, they (the decrees of Trent) express it, (the present corrupt teaching of the Church of Rome,) whether in fact other senses short of the sense conveyed in (her) present teaching will not fulfil their letter, and may not even now in

‘*point of fact be held in that Church.*’ On the other hand, when the Four Tutors consider that the Tract ‘suggests’ that the XXXIX Articles ‘do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines of Purgatory &c., as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do,’ they seem to have misunderstood the Tract which actually says, as quoted by Mr. Newman in his Letter, p. 10. ‘What is opposed is the *received doctrine of the day and unhappily of this day too, or the doctrine of the Roman Schools.*’ As things have turned out, it is perhaps to be lamented that Mr. Newman did not repeat this caution in each head of Art. xxii. and he says himself, (Letter, p. 9.) ‘this distinction would have been made in far stronger terms had I not often before spoken against the actual state of the Roman Church, or could I have anticipated the sensation which the appearance of the Tract has excited.’ And in the second edition, the Tract seems as explicit on the subject as can possibly be desired. Let me quote successively its statement on the first four of the five subjects mentioned in the Tutor’s Letter.

‘Let it be considered then, whether on the whole the ‘Romish doctrine of purgatory’ which the Article condemns, and which *was generally believed in the Roman Church three centuries since as well as now*, viewed in its essence, be not the doctrine that the punishment of unrighteous

Christians is temporary not eternal, and that the purification of the righteous is a portion of the same punishment: together with the superstitions and impostures, for the sake of gain, consequent thereupon.' p. 28.

'The doctrine then of Pardons spoken of in the Article is the doctrine *maintained and acted on in the Roman Church*, that remission of the penalties of sin in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope, with such abuses as money-payments consequent thereupon^a.' p. 31.

'On the whole, then, by the Romish doctrine of the veneration and worshipping of images and relics, the Article means all maintenance of those idolatrous honours *which have been and are paid them so commonly throughout the Church of Rome*, with the superstitions, profanities, and impurities consequent thereupon.' p. 36.

'By the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, then, the Article means all maintenance of addresses to them which entrench upon the incommunicable honour of God alone, *such as have been, and are in the Church of Rome*, and

^a This would seem one of the passages alluded to in Mr. Newman's Postscript, in which the apparent vagueness arose 'from the circumstance, that, the main drift of the Tract being 'that of illustrating the Articles from the *Homilies*, the doctrines of the Articles are sometimes brought out only so far 'as the Homilies explain them, which is in some cases an 'inadequate representation.' In the first edition it stood, 'the 'pardons then spoken of in the Article are large and reckless 'indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money-payments:' which not unnaturally seems to have given many persons the impression, that the Tract did not consider the doctrine of the Pope claiming power to remit the penalties of sin in the next life, condemned by the Article, when such remission was not 'obtained on money-payments.'

such as equally with the peculiar doctrine of purgatory, pardons, and worshipping and adoration of images and relics, *as actually taught in that Church*, are unknown to the Catholic Church.' p. 42.

Mr. Newman's opinion then is, that the doctrines on these subjects condemned by the Articles are *not* taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome in the sense of *being obligatory on the belief* of each individual member of the Church, or so that *that Church is irrevocably bound to them*; they *are* taught authoritatively in that they are not merely 'practices and opinions which intelligent 'Romanists repudiate as much as we do,' but, 'maintained and acted on in the Roman Church,' 'actually taught in that Church,' 'an existing *ruling spirit and view in the Church*,' which is 'a corruption and perversion of the truth,' and, 'against which I think the XXXIX Articles speak.' (Letter, p. 10.) The whole passage in Mr. N.'s Letter, p. 26. from 'for instance,' to 'actually have done,' would make all this still more clear if there were room to quote it. *Authoritative teaching* may naturally mean the *teaching of those in authority*: but then individuals, members of the Roman Church, are not bound to believe such teaching, except so far as it is borne out by *that Church's authoritative statements*: the Tract considers the Articles as directed against *the authoritative teaching* so lamentably prevalent throughout the Roman Church, not the *authoritative statements* of that Church herself.

And now for the more important part of Mr. Wilson's Letter. The point which most people will perhaps feel to be brought out most forcibly in Mr. Wilson's Letter, he has expressed as follows ;

‘ I am not inclined either to restrain or to expand the sense of the Articles, as men may think the Homilies expound them ; nor do I recognise the Homilies as the sole or best interpreter of their sense, though they are most valuable historical documents, and contain a doctrine necessary for the times when they were composed. But Mr. N. undertook to make out his principles as applied to the XXII. and XXXI. Articles, chiefly by a reference to them as representing the sense of the Articles. “ The Homily and therefore the Article,” p. 26. He rested his case on ground chosen by himself ; his own ground even betrays him.’ p. 17..

And we are thus led to two topics for discussion ; first, Are the Homilies legitimate interpreters of these Articles ? and, secondly, Has the Tract fairly represented the teaching of the Homilies with respect to them ? and I will take the two Articles (the twenty-second and thirty-first), to which Mr. Wilson confines his observations, separately.

Before proceeding however with the subject, let me beg persons to consider, that the mere fact of an interpretation appearing at first to them a forced interpretation, is no argument whatever that it is really so, but only that it is *new* to them. I suppose many of us may remember doctrines or opinions on various subjects which when first broached appeared to us quite ex-

travagant, and which we now hold almost as first truths. Any thing which takes us quite by surprise appears forced. I am not denying that in parts of the Tract interpretations are given which to me do not seem the most obvious, (see post, p. 26.) but I cannot consider that of the twenty-second Article as in the number. On the contrary, it does seem that nothing but long habit could have made us imagine, e. g. that ‘*doctrina Romanensium de Purgatorio*’ means *all* teaching of Purgatory, or ‘*doctrina Romanensium de invocatione Sanctorum*’ means *all* invocation of Saints. I have heard it said in the last fortnight, that the same principles which reconcile subscription to the twenty-second Article with the opinions maintained in the Tract, might reconcile subscription to the second Article with the Socinian heresy. Now I would almost stake the whole case on the fair issue of that question. Can any thing be more dissimilar in manner and tone than those two Articles? The second contains an accurately drawn up dogmatic positive statement of the high mystery on which it treats, such as the Church has ever had recourse to for the preservation of the Faith committed to her, and such as it is the tendency of the present day to consider subtle and overstrained. The twenty-second contains *no one positive statement*: it puts together four or five topics, which cannot be said to be all very closely connected with each other, and declares that ‘*doctrina Romanensium*’ on those topics is

a fond thing, &c. Would not any one naturally infer from this opposition what Mr. Newman *does* infer? that the framers of the Articles see two things before their eyes, the Creeds which have come down to them from the early ages of the Church, and the corrupt system in existence practically to a great extent overlaying these Creeds; that the former they hand down as they have received them, the latter they protest against, as they see it, generally and in the mass: not being careful to draw up accurate statements of those true principles which are contradictory to the existing abuses, nor again tracing up the latter to their ultimate principles and condemning *them*; but without busying themselves with such investigations, requiring as they would leisure, accuracy of thought, and *unity of opinion*, condemning what they saw *as* they saw it, energizing and practically active throughout the Church. Such would, I feel convinced, be the natural impressions made on our minds by this Article, but for long habit of viewing it in a different light. Still did statements of a different character exist in the Homilies, serious doubt would be thrown over such a conclusion. The Homilies are the *sole* contemporary document recognised by our Church in addition to the Prayer Book and Articles; and did they contain, what the Articles do not, carefully drawn up dogmatic statements on the subjects mentioned in this twenty-second Article, we might well consider them as our

Church's authoritative explanation of her words 'doctrina Romanensium.' These are words so general and indeterminate, as to compel us to resort for an explanation of them elsewhere: were there no other contemporary document sanctioned by our Church, then to history; but there being such, to that document. Such then is the force as regards this Article of an appeal to the Homilies: not of course that we are bound to every sentence and paragraph in them, (see Tract, p. 66.) but that the general scope and tone of them on this subject will give us at least the nearest approach to our Church's authoritative explanation of what has absolutely no meaning without such explanation, the words 'doctrina Romanensium.' And that on the whole the tone of the Homilies is precisely what we should à priori have expected from the wording of the Article, I think few will deny: we find there long and detailed protests against the existing practical system, but no attention given to the task of drawing up a consistent antagonist view: *their* tone is as negative as that of the Article.

Nor does Mr. Wilson on the whole seem to deny this, for he rather joins issue on detached sentences from the quotations in the Tract, than on the general tendency of the teaching of the Homilies^b. Still I cannot agree in his criticisms on the particular passages he does criticize. Let us first take

^b There is one exception in p. 16, to which I shall presently allude.

his extract from the quotation in the Tract on the subject of purgatory.

‘ Where is, then, the third place which they call purgatory? or, where shall our prayers help and profit the dead? S. Augustin doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such in all Scripture.’ p. 8.

Now even taking this sentence by itself, surely it is rather straining it to imply that the writer disbelieved *any* intermediate state in which the souls of the just should remain between death and the day of judgment. Yet if it do not mean this, it can mean nothing to Mr. Wilson’s purpose; for if the wording of it will admit the belief of *any* intermediate state for those who die in God’s faith and fear, it will admit the belief of a state of gradual purification, whether with pain or without: and if it be supposed to deny any intermediate state whatever, we must impute to the homilist not only a strange ignorance of what is so commonly connected with St. Augustine’s name, viz. his advocacy of a doctrine very much resembling the received Roman doctrine of purgatory; but also we must suppose that his own belief was (for I can think of no other alternative) that the soul is in a state of insensibility, from the time of its leaving the mortal body until the Great Day: a belief far from being common surely in our Church from that day to

this, and formally condemned in the Articles put forth in the time of Edward the Sixth^c. But whatever comes of the criticism on this sentence by itself, take the whole passage together, and the account given of it by the Tract^u will I really think commend itself to most minds as a very fair account. We need not of course suppose, that the homilist kept distinctly before his mind from first to last any definite doctrinal view: see p. 11. But the very words which follow, ‘*Chrysostom likewise is of this mind, that unless we wash away our sins in this present world, we shall find no comfort afterward: and St. Cyprian saith, &c.*’ shew what the writer had in his mind in the sentence before us. Here then shall follow the quotation from the Homily as made in the Tract, and the Tract’s comment upon it: the summing up in the second edition of the Tract, as to the doctrine concerning purgatory which it is supposed the Articles condemn, has been already introduced.

“ Now doth St. Augustine say, that those men which are cast into prison after this life, on that condition, may in no wise be holpen, though we would help them never so much. And why? Because the *sentence* of GOD is *unchangeable*, and cannot be *re-voked again*. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help others, or others may help us, by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. For, as the preacher saith, ‘ When the tree falleth, whether it be toward the south, or toward the north, in what place soever the tree falleth,

^c ‘ Qui^u animas^u defunctorum prædicant usque ad diem iudicii absque omni sensu dormire, aut illas asserunt unà cum corporibus mori . . . ab orthodoxâ fide . . . prorsus dissentiunt.’

there it lieth:’ meaning thereby, that every mortal man *dieth either in the state of salvation or damnation*, according as the words of the Evangelist John do plainly import, saying, ‘ He that believeth on the SON of GOD hath eternal life; but he that believeth not on the SON, shall never see life, but the wrath of GOD abideth upon him, ’—where is then the third place, which they call purgatory? Or where shall our prayers help and profit the dead? St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture. Chrysostom likewise is of this mind, that, unless we wash away our sins in this present world, we shall find no comfort afterward. And St. Cyprian saith, that, after death, repentance and sorrow of pain shall be without fruit, weeping also shall be in vain, and prayer shall be to no purpose. Therefore he counselleth all men to make provision for themselves while they may, because, when they are once departed out of this life, there is no place for *repentance*, nor yet for satisfaction.”—*Homily concerning Prayer*, pp. 282, 283.

“ Now it would seem, from this passage, that the Purgatory contemplated by the Homily, was one for which no one will for an instant pretend to adduce even those Fathers who most favour Rome, *viz.* one *in which our state would be changed*, in which God’s sentence could be reversed. ‘ The *sentence of God*,’ says the writer, ‘ is *unchangeable*, and cannot be revoked again; there is no place for *repentance*^d. ’ ”

On the subject of pardons, the introduction made in the 2d edition of the Tract as quoted (p. 6.) will perhaps be a sufficient explanation of the author’s meaning.

On the subject of ‘ worshipping and adoration as

^d See Appendix.

well of images as of relics,' Mr. Wilson complains of the Tract as doing the same thing I had just now occasion to complain of him for doing, taking a passage apart from its context, and so laying undue stress upon it. But it will still perhaps appear to many people, that the additional passages quoted by Mr. Wilson do not really alter the state of the case. To do justice to both sides, it will be necessary to make rather a long extract from Mr. Wilson's Letter, (p. 14, 15.)

“ Here I wish to draw your attention to the passage referred to, with the quotations from the Homilies.

Tract, p. 23. “ And a verification of such an understanding of the Article is afforded us in some sentences in the Homily on Peril of Idolatry, in which, as far as regards relics, a *certain* ‘ veneration’ is sanctioned by its tone in speaking of them, though not of course the Romish veneration.

“ The sentences referred to run as follows:—

“ In the Tripartite Ecclesiastical History, the Ninth Book, and Forty-eighth Chapter, is testified, that ‘ Epiphanius, being yet alive, did work miracles: and that after his death, devils, *being expelled at his grave or tomb*, did roar.’ Thus you see what authority St. Jerome (who has just been mentioned) and that most ancient history give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius.”

“ Here the quotation in the Tract ends, but the Homily goes on.

“ *Thus you see what authority St. Jerome, and that most ancient history, give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius, whose judgment of images in churches and temples, then beginning by stealth to creep in, is worthy to be noted.*”

“ His judgment having been shewn in

“ That when he entered into a certain church to pray, he found there a linen cloth hanging on the church door painted, and having in it the image of Christ as it were, or of some other saint; therefore when I did see the image of a man hanging in the Church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, I did tear it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the church that they should wind a poor man that was dead in the said cloth, and so bury him.”
Hom. ib.

Again:—

“ St. Ambrose, in his Treatise of the Death of Theodosius the Emperor, saith, ‘ Helena found the Cross, and the title on it. She worshipped the King, and not the wood, surely (for that is an heathenish error and the vanity of the wicked) but she worshipped Him that hanged on the Cross, and whose Name was written on the title,’ and so forth. See both the godly empress’s fact, and St. Ambrose’s judgment at once; they thought it had been an heathenish error, and vanity of the wicked, *to have worshipped the Cross itself, which was embrued with our SAVIOUR CHRIST’S own precious blood.*”—*Peril of Idolatry, part 2, circ. init.*

“ In these passages the writer does not positively commit himself to the miracles at Epiphanius’s tomb, or the invention of the true Cross, but he evidently wishes the hearer to think he believes in both. This he would not do, if he thought all honour paid to relics wrong.”—
Tr. p. 24.

But if the latter passage is finished to the end of its paragraph, it stands thus:—

“ *They thought it had been an heathenish error to have worshipped the Cross itself, which was embrued with our Saviour Christ’s own precious blood. And we fall down before every cross piece of timber, which is but an image of that cross.*”
—Hom.

“ This is but an argument *a fortiori*, by no means shewing that the writer wished the hearer to think he believes in the invention of the true Cross, but—if they who thought they had found it would not worship even that, much less, &c. Neither does the Homilist at all concern himself as to his hearers believing in the miracle at Epiphanius’s tomb. The miracles (he says) were believed of old, which shows in what great estimation he was held. And if he of so great estimation tore a cloth painted with an image &c. neither of the passages bear upon the question of relics, much less convey any judgment of the Homilist.

“ This is a very small matter in itself, that in extracting a quotation, a line or two of the succeeding context should have escaped the eye; but in this case these few lines would give a totally different character to the passages taken, and to the thread of the argument of the writer. The inference from these citations was very material; an inference which depends solely on the places, and which I do not believe could be derived from any other extracts from the Homilies, unless equally incomplete.”

But ‘ the thread of the argument of the writer ’ in these passages is surely of no importance. Who *denies* that it is an *à fortiori* argument? The plain question is, would he have expressed himself in the course of it as he did in the two passages quoted by the Tract, had he considered *all* veneration of relics forbidden by the Church of England, ‘ as a fond thing rather repugnant to the word of God?’ Few surely will think so. As to the first quotation, what veneration of relics *can* the Tract be supposed to advocate as lawful, *beyond* that

implied in a belief that relics may work miracles : ' that most ancient history ' professes such belief, and, as all must feel, is not spoken of in a tone which would be adopted in speaking of a veneration forbidden by the Church of England. As to the second quotation, not to lay stress on the miracle by which tradition reports the discovery of the true cross to have been made, (which would make the case stronger,) at all events, to feel an interest in such discovery shews a *certain* ' veneration of relics.' Nay what force in saying they did not *worship* the true Cross unless they paid it *some* veneration. Are St. Ambrose then and the ' godly empress ' spoken of as if entertaining a feeling condemned by our Articles ? rather as the continuation cited by Mr. Wilson makes still more clear, they are spoken of as authorities to be deferred to. Consider too the very tone of the passage, ' the cross which was embued with our Saviour Christ's own precious blood.'

Mr. Wilson's next quotation from the Homilies is the following, (p. 17.) cited by him to shew ' that the homilist would deem even the ' *having* of images if not Popish, unlawful : ' but of course the enquiry is, what light do the Homilies throw on the phrase in the Articles ' *doctrina Romanensium* ? ' and therefore the only pertinent question is, what veneration of images they consider ' *Popish* ? ' But indeed the passage shews plainly, that what the writer considers *doc-*

trinally forbidden is *idolatry*, and gives as his opinion that to have images in churches is (not in itself wrong, but) most *dangerous* for the *peril* of idolatry.

‘Wherefore the images of God, our Saviour Christ, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Apostles, Martyrs, and others of notable holiness, are, of all other images, most dangerous for the peril of idolatry, and therefore greatest heed to be taken that none of them be suffered to stand in Churches and Temples.’—*Peril Idol.* 3rd part.

In the last passage Mr. Wilson has quoted, he has pointed out that Mr. Newman’s transcriber or printer has made a mistake; but the introduction of the words omitted only makes the summing up in the Tract more closely accurate. The passage in the Homily, which had been accidentally mutilated in the Tract, when read in full is this: ‘Is not this stooping and kneeling before them, *adoration* of them, which is forbidden so earnestly by God’s word?’ And the summing up in the Tract is as follows; ‘Now the veneration and *worship* condemned in these and other passages are such as these, *kneeling before them, &c.*’ p. 36. ‘Kneeling before them’ is mentioned in the Tract as being part of that *adoration* of them condemned by the Article.

It should be added in fairness, that there remains a passage quoted by Mr. Wilson in p. 14, against which nothing has been said: let it have its weight: it seems certainly to speak of *having*

images as 'contrary to the authority of the Scriptures.' But let me also cite a passage from the Homilies quoted by Mr. Wilson in a different connexion, but drawing the same distinction we have seen before between 'having' them and 'worshipping' them. p. 30.

'And thus you see how, from having of images privately, it came to public setting of them up in churches and temples, although *without harm* at the first, as was then of some wise and learned men judged: and from simply having them there, it came *at the last* to worshipping of them.'

· On the whole then, does not the case seem made out by the 'four close pages from the Homilies' quoted by the Tract, that the main tendency of their teaching is a vehement protest against the corruptions they saw around them, not the assertion of any one systematic view in opposition? Nay, let it be asked, who is there among us all in any degree religiously-minded, who having in his possession a piece of sculpture on a religious subject, would treat it as though it were a common ornament? and if not, what does he shew but a *certain* 'veneration of images,' 'though 'of course not the *Romish*?'

The last subject under the twenty-second Article is the Invocation of Saints. And in this too the quotations from the Homilies introduced in the Tract *do* seem to shew, that the writers had not in view the task of assigning the exact limits within

which the realizing of our Communion with departed Saints may be lawful to the spiritually-minded Christian, but, as before, that of bearing witness against the practical corruptions they found actually in existence^a. As to the three first quotations, any reader must surely grant this; and as to the fourth from which Mr. Wilson has introduced an extract, (p. 20.) an attentive perusal of the whole will, I think, lead to the conclusion expressed in the Tract: that the idea in the mind of the writer as to what he was attacking, was what he saw in men's practice on all sides of him: a habit of addressing Saints in such a manner as to make them *at the time the ultimate object of thought*. The passages put in italics in the Tract would seem to my mind to put this beyond fair doubt. Of course it is not necessary to maintain that the Catholic Christian will readily go along with the line of argument adopted in the Homily; the mere question is, what was the religious practice against which he was writing as corrupt and 'Romish?' Mr. Wilson has introduced another quotation from the Homilies which shall here be inserted, (the italics are not Mr. Wilson's:) p. 21.

'For it is evident, that our image-maintainers have the same opinion of saints which the Gentiles had of their false gods, and thereby are moved to make them images, as the Gentiles did. If answer be made, that they make saints but intercessors to God, and means for such things as they would obtain of God; that is, even after the

^a See also p. 30.

Gentiles' idolatrous usage, *to make them of saints, gods,* called *Dii Medioximi*, to be mean intercessors and helpers to God, *as though he did not hear, or should be weary if he did all alone.* So did the Gentiles teach, that there was one chief power *working by other, as means*; and so they made all gods subject to fate or destiny; as Lucian in his Dialogues feigneth, that Neptune made suit to Mercury, that he might speak with Jupiter. And therefore in this also, it is most evident, that our image-maintainers be all one in opinion with the Gentile idolaters.' *Against Peril of Idolatry*, part 3.

Now does the drift of this passage seem fairly applicable to the case of any holy and self-denying man whose thoughts are in Heaven, ever resting upon God his Supreme Good, and who may feel himself drawn to the practice of asking the prayers of departed Saints to that God, as he does the prayers of his living brethren? does the idea of such a person seem to have been for a moment present to the mind of the writer? On the other hand, to one kind of error (which certainly exists, perhaps to a very great extent, as *matter of opinion* in the Roman Church at the present day, and most probably at that day also,) it is remarkably applicable: viz. such as the opinion that the Blessed Virgin is appointed by our Lord the *sole necessary channel through* which His grace shall flow to His Church, so that in fact addresses to her are more *immediate* applications for a supply of grace than to our Lord Himself^d: and opinions which are far from going to

^d The following passages, taken from Archbishop Ussher's answers to a Jesuit, have been shewn me since the above was

this shocking extent, but which tend in the same direction, may well be aimed at in this passage ; as

written ; and they will serve both to make my meaning clearer, and also to shew the existence at that period (S. Bernardinus lived in the 15th century) of writings which would be altogether adequate objects for the strictures in this passage of the Homily. The quotations are given on the authority of the Cambridge edition of Ussher, 1835.

A tempore enim quo Virgo mater concipit in utero Verbum Dei, quandam, ut sic dicam, jurisdictionem seu auctoritatem in omni Spiritus sancti processione temporali, ita quod nulla creatura aliquam a Deo obtinuit gratiam vel virtutem, nisi secundum ipsius piæ matris dispensationem. Bernardin. Senens. Serm. lxi. Artic. i. cap. 8.

Et quia talis est mater Filii Dei qui producit Spiritum sanctum, ideo omnia dona virtutis et gratiæ ipsius Spiritus sancti, quibus vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, et quantum vult, per manus ipsius administrantur. Id. ibid.

Nulla gratia de cœlo nisi ea dispensante ad nos descendit. Hoc enim singulariter officium divinitus ab æterno adepta est, sicut Proverb. viii. ipsa testatur, dicens, Ab æterno ordinata sum ; scilicet dispensatrix cælestium gratiarum. Id. ibid. Artic. iii. cap. 3.

In Christo fuit plenitudo gratiæ sicut, in capite influente, in Maria vero, sicut in collo transfundente. Unde Cantic. vii. de Virgine ad Christum Salomon ait, Collum tuum sicut turris eburnea. Nam sicut per collum vitales spiritus a capite descendunt in corpus, sic per Virginem a capite Christo vitales gratiæ in ejus corpus mysticum transfunduntur. Id. ibid. Artic. i. cap. 8. Artic. ii. et cap. 10. ex Pseudo-Hieronymi Sermone de Assumpt. Mariæ. Sicut enim a capite, mediante collo, descendunt omnia nutrimenta corporis, sic a Christo per beatam Virginem in nos veniunt omnia bona et beneficia quæ Deus nobis confert. Nam ipsa est dispensatrix gratiarum et beneficiorum Dei. Joan. Herolt. in Sermon. Discipuli de

certainly no one will doubt that to whatever extent they did exist, to whatever extent Saints were allowed to obscure in the mind the vision of the one God, such opinions would be part of the 'doctrina Romanensium' condemned by the Article.

On the subject of the thirty-first Article, I hardly know what to say. If Mr. Wilson considers that the doctrine is condemned in it of the Eucharist

Tempore, Serm. cxliii. Per collum Virginis apud Deum gratia et intercessio intelligitur, ita ut ejus intercessio sit veluti collum, per quod a Deo omnes gratiæ præsidiaque in homines transfunduntur. Blas. Viegas in Apocalyps. cap. xii. Comment. ii. sect. 10. num. 1. Collum enim dicitur, quia per Virginem universa in nos a Deo, tanquam a capite, beneficia derivantur. Id. ibid. num. 2.

Quasi sublato Virginis patrocínio, perinde atque halitu intercluso, peccator vivere diutius non possit. Viegas, ibid. sect. ii. num. 6.

Tot creaturæ serviunt gloriosæ Virgini Mariæ, quot serviunt Trinitati. Omnes nempe creaturæ, quemcunque gradum teneant in creatis, sive spirituales ut angeli, sive rationales ut homines, sive corporales ut corpora cœlestia vel elementa, et omnia quæ sunt in cœlo et in terra, sive damnati sive beati, quæ omnia sunt divino imperio subjugata, gloriosæ Virgini sunt subjecta. Ille enim qui Dei Filius est et Virginis benedictæ, volens, ut sic dicam, paterno principatui quodammodo principatum æquiparare maternum, ipse quæ Deus erat matri famulabatur in terra. Unde Lucæ ii. scriptum est de Virgine et glorioso Joseph, Erat subditus illis. Præterea hæc est vera, Divino imperio omnia famulantur et Virgo; et iterum hæc est vera, Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur et Deus. Id. ibid. cap. 6.

being an offering for the quick and dead, he must condemn some of our most respected Divines almost from that day to this. But the whole scope of the Article, as is plain from both its title and wording, is to vindicate the soleness and all-sufficiency of the One Sacrifice.

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

“The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. *Wherefore* the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

The ‘sacrifices of masses’ are only introduced as bearing upon this point: they saw that practically ‘masses as observed in the Church of Rome ‘actually impaired or obscured the doctrine of the ‘one Atonement;’ (Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 27.) and condemned them *as* so doing^b: they considered most justly any thing which did so as a ‘blasphemous fable,’ and we find from the Homilies as well as other sources that the particular observances which had this effect, were also so full of other shameful abuses, as to deserve the name of ‘perniciosa impostura’ as well. With regard to Mr. Wilson’s quotation from Bishop Jewel, it is only necessary to remark that no one has maintained

^b See page 30.

that belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice is *required* of those who subscribe our formularies ; and that Bishop Jewel's writings have never been recognized by our Church as of authority.

I trust I have now succeeded in vindicating the Tract's interpretation of the twenty-second and thirty-first Articles from the difficulties which have prevented Mr. Wilson from receiving it. As my object in writing is to support the Tract, not to engage in controversy with him, no further remarks on his Letter seem necessary : but I am naturally led on to consider what seems certainly to me a more difficult question than those which Mr. Wilson has raised, and which has been alluded to in a very unassuming and pleasing spirit, by ' one who owes much to the Tracts for the Times : ' I mean the Article on General Councils. I fear that what may be said on it may possibly displease some whom it is most painful to displease ; I mean that most highly respected class of our living divines, who consider the spirit in which the English Reformation was carried on by its human agents not to have been on the whole uncatholic. Such persons do not feel the difficulty which some others may feel : they would join issue with those who claim the Articles as ruling matters on the Protestant side, by denying that any powerful party at the time could have wished so to rule them : to them it will have never occurred to doubt, I quote the words used in a private letter by one deeply venerated

person, ' that *General Councils* were never meant to include *Œcumenical.*' Some will probably carry this principle still further, and consider our Articles to *exclude* the adherents of Protestantism, (or as they would rather call it ultra Protestantism,) such as we find them at the present day.

But still as several persons remain who, with all their anxiety to follow such revered authorities, cannot bring themselves to acquiesce in this view of the case, and as their feelings have met with sanction not less high than that of the editors of Mr. Froude's Remains, (see preface to the 2d part of that work,) it seems no wanton outrage on feelings which must ever command our highest respect, but direct necessity which compels them in self-defence to express their view of our formularies, and of the ground on which such as they consider they may honestly subscribe them. They cannot deny, that to them there appears an obvious leaning to Protestantism in the wording of some few of the Articles ; the point on which they join issue being, whether this leaning has actually been allowed to have its full effect. Two alternatives are open to them : either we may consider, that those who drew up the Articles had before their minds all through their task the thought of an opposite party in the Church whom they must not offend, and whose views if they *actually contradicted* in the Articles, the sanction of Convocation (the sole Church authority of the time) was not to be expected, (Tract, p. 82.

second edition): or it remains that God's merciful providence watched over this branch of His Church, (favoured as she has ever been far beyond our deserts, and all the dearer to us her faithful children from her present captivity, and from the imminent dangers which have threatened her,) so watched over her, I say, amidst all the excesses of that period, as *without the intervention of human agency* to protect her from herself, and graciously save her from any *formal* admission of the unhappy errors then prevalent. But I think that without falling back on the latter of these suppositions, there is abundant internal evidence in our formularies themselves (without going to the historical question which *well deserves an attentive investigation*) to convince us of the former. If persons will not reject this notion at once as forced and sophistical, but allow themselves to carry it with them as they look at the Articles, I am persuaded they will see more and more probability of its truth; they will see in the Articles in dispute (which at last are but few) a remarkable attempt on the part of the framers to present an imposing external appearance of Protestantism, while nothing is really decided which might prevent those who deferred more really than they did to primitive authority from subscribing. This of course is the meaning of the last paragraph in the Tract, and it well deserves our careful attention.

For instance (see Tract, p. 44.) the passage in the 28th Article, 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Sup-

‘per was not *by Christ’s ordinance* reserved, carried
 ‘about, lifted up, or worshipped;’ in the 25th, ‘the
 ‘Sacraments *were not ordained by Christ* to be gazed
 ‘upon or to be carried about;’ and in the 32d,
 ‘Bishops, Priests, and Deacons *are not commanded by*
 ‘*God’s law*, either to vow the estate of single life
 ‘or to abstain from marriage;’ would bear an appear-
 ance to Foreign Protestants of a spirited protest
 against what they considered corruptions, (part of
 them of course really were so); but when those at
 home who were more nearly concerned, as having
 to sign them, came to look more closely, they would
 find nothing asserted beyond the very plain truth,
 that such ordinances were not *ordained by Christ*,
 and so might *lawfully* (even the question of expedi-
 ency being waived) be discontinued by the Church.
 And so again the 14th Article, while it bears on
 its surface the mark of a loud protest against Rome,
as actually worded is barely more than a truism:
 the question of course being, not whether we can
 do more for His sake than *of bounden duty is required*,
 which no orthodox believer ever dreamt of holding,
 (God forbid !) but whether it is possible for His sake
 to do more, to make higher advances in holiness,
 than the *least* which in His great mercy for the
 merit of Christ’s death, He will accept as sufficient
 to salvation. And to deny this, seems necessarily
 either to deny that holiness *as such* is required for
 salvation, (I mean independently of that degree of
 holiness which will in the judgment of some neces-

sarily result from the news of forgiveness, apprehended by faith,) or to assert that the least falling short of holiness, attainable by us through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, will entail on us eternal ruin. Now on all these Articles if persons of different sentiments protested, they might be triumphantly challenged to point out the statement to which they objected: they could find none, *any more than we can at the present day*. Indeed it is worth the consideration of any person studying the Homilies, especially as illustrating part of the Articles, whether there is not in a large number of passages a remarkable union of *truth* in point of *doctrine*, and *error* in point of *fact*, (of course on such points they have no claim upon us): *truth of doctrine* in declaring certain opinions condemnable, *error in fact* in considering them held by the more religious Roman Catholics^e. Great part of what appears to have struck some persons as disingenuousness in

^e Even as to the Articles there is nothing to interfere with the supposition (not an impossible one) that both in the 14th and 31st the framers were mistaken as to the matter of fact, what was the doctrine held by serious Roman Catholics. Such a mistake would seem a natural result, from their apparent tendency to view religious opinions *from without*, rather looking at them in their effects on the mass of men, than applying themselves to the enquiry, what might be their meaning, and what place they might legitimately hold in the mind of the more religious. Of course mistakes of this sort no more prevent subscription, than their ascribing the Athanasian Creed to St. Athanasius, or a passage to St. Augustine in the 29th Article, which Porson pronounces spurious.

portions of the Tract, is I am persuaded referable to this cause.

Accordingly, to come nearer our present more immediate purpose, notwithstanding the strong protests made in favour of Holy Scripture in the sixth and twentieth Articles, as well as the one before us, a very remarkable silence is maintained on the question, *who is to be judge* of the scripturalness of a doctrine alleged as necessary: a silence which there seems absolutely no way of accounting for, except some such desire of comprehension as I have spoken of. Another thing very much to be observed, and perfectly inexplicable on the hypothesis of Protestant principles having had their full freedom in the reconstruction of our formularies, is, that the necessity of proof from Scripture is every where confined to truths *necessary to salvation*: this is so not only in the sixth, twentieth, and twenty-first Articles, but also in the Ordination Service; so that it cannot possibly be the result of accident.

The Bishop. ‘Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines *required of necessity for eternal salvation* and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required *of necessity to eternal salvation*, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?’ It is needless to point out how very unlike such a form as this is to what would be the free and unrestrained expression of

persons, who held either that the individual or that the local Church had *no* authority to guide them on doctrinal points, except the letter of Scripture. The qualification as to truths 'necessary to salvation' would have actually no meaning in the mouths of such persons. On the other hand, the result has been that the later English Church, as distinguished from other Churches, has borne a most remarkable witness to the truth which appears to have been altogether Catholic, that *all* points of necessary faith are contained (whether on the surface or latently) in Scripture, and that it is the duty of the Church to draw them from thence for the edification of her children: not merely to say to them, 'believe this for the Church believes it,' but 'believe this, for the Church has ever seen it in these certain passages of Scripture; dwell on them carefully and reverently yourselves, that you may go on more and more to see it there too.'

For the proof of the Catholicity of this doctrine the reader is referred to the thirteenth of Mr. Newman's Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church: and it is one which it seems to have been the peculiar office of the English Church to preserve in these later ages. To say so; it may be hoped, involves no uncharitableness to other Churches; it is consistent with a full and grateful acknowledgment, that on other Catholic truths they have borne a more *explicit* testimony than we have, nor is it meant to imply that they

have formally denied this, (of course we are speaking of the formal statements of each Church, not of the practical corruptions in either): but has there not been a tendency in the later Roman Church, arising naturally from the absence of a *full* and *prominent* statement on her part of this truth, to teach saving truth more exclusively on her own authority than the example of the early Church would warrant, and so to be remiss in the duty of encouraging in the laity the reverent study of the Sacred Volume? and may we not by the way allude to this as one out of the numberless marks we have on us of being a living branch of Christ's Church, that the Roman Church and ours *together*^f make up so far more an adequate representation of the early Church, (our several defects and practical corruptions as it were protesting against each other,) than either separately^g?

Having then so far cleared our way, let us enter upon the consideration of the twenty-first Article; and see whether any thing more Pro-

^f The Greek Church is not mentioned, because its practice on such matters is understood to be much the same with the Roman.

^g It is much to be wished that Roman Catholic writers would remember that it is not incumbent on any member of our Church to maintain our superiority to them either in formal statement or in practice. We do not deny *their* Communion to be part of the Universal Church, though they deny *ours* to be so.

testant has really been introduced into it than this characteristic, and most honourable feature of the English Church? I suppose most people on reading it first are struck with this impression, that it is contrasting the authority of General Councils with that of Scripture; and saying that the former being composed of fallible men, are themselves fallible; and therefore claim at our hands, or else at the hands of the local Church, no deference beyond the point to which we can see that Scripture bears out their decrees; nor is it necessary to deny either that this would be the private opinion of the framers, or that they wished it should at first sight convey this impression.

‘General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared (*nisi ostendi possint*) that they be taken out of holy Scripture.’

Perhaps most readers will agree, that this certainly at first sight seems to run very smoothly according to the purport I have mentioned; but I have omitted a few words, which when introduced spoil the natural course of the argument altogether; nay it is not too much to say make it impossible

to construct the argument out of the Article as it really stands.

‘ Things ordained by them *as necessary to salvation* have neither strength nor authority, &c.’

Now as these words are just the introduction of what has been mentioned as the characteristic excellence of the later English Church, so on the other hand have they not every appearance of being introduced in consideration of the wishes of men more Catholicly minded than the framers? That they found their way there accidentally, no one will for an instant think, who observes the very same clause in the sixth and twentieth Articles, and also in the Ordination Service. Yet on what Protestant principle, on what principle *denying authority on religious doctrines to all* General Councils, have they any meaning whatever? No one will maintain that *all* religious truths are *necessary to salvation*; why then on those *not* necessary have General Councils authority independently of Scripture, according to the words of the Article, and not on others? No! I feel persuaded that fair minded men will see in this Article the result of a compromise with the opposite party, and an intentional abstinence from determining the question whether *some* General Councils *have given them authority by Christ to determine religious doctrine with infallible truth*; ruling at the same time so much as this, that any General Council which

determined that to be a point of *necessary faith* which should not be contained and *able to be pointed out* (ostendi possint) in Holy Scripture, would err in so doing, and therefore would not be so far such infallible Council. And if it be asked, what remains in that case as the force of the Article at all? an obvious answer is found in the very general opinion, that the Roman Church had considered those to be Œcumenical Councils which were not so; and with regard to which one mark of their not being so was, that they seemed to rule as points necessary to salvation, what they did not even profess to see in Scripture; while on the other hand practically doctrines which the Reformers desired to oppose were grounded (with or without reason) on the decrees of such General Councils: against which they declare ‘General Councils may err and have erred, &c.’ For the importance of this test of the Catholicity of a General Council, see Newman’s *Prophetic office of the Church*, Lect. viii. where he brings out the fact, that the first General Council ‘which professed to ground its decrees not on ‘Scripture sanction but mainly on tradition,’ was ‘the first which framed as an *Article of faith* what ‘was beside and beyond the Apostles’ Creed,’ was ‘the Council which decreed the worship of images,’ and was the first which took place *certainly* after the schism had taken place between the East and West.

It will perhaps be hardly cogent in arguing

on this subject to bring forward the names of our divines who have held the infallibility of *some* General Councils, as they will only be included in the charge of inconsistency with their subscription: but it will be very cogent to introduce the canon of the Convocation of 1571, the very same Convocation which sanctioned our Articles, as shewing that that assembly was little likely to have assented to formularies which taught the Protestant rule of Private Judgment. ‘Preachers shall be careful that they never teach ought in a sermon to be religiously held and believed by the people except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, *and which the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected from that very doctrine.*’ It may be added, that in the second edition of the Tract the writer has made more clear his method of reconciling the wording of the Article with those opinions which I have just been arguing were intended to be admitted by it, by introducing into the passage which follows the words in brackets, ‘General Councils then may err [*as such—may err*] *unless* in any case it is promised,’ &c.

Before leaving the subject of this Article, it may be as well to add, that the first clause so congenial in its wording with the prevalent Erastianism of that day, is nevertheless strictly in accordance with primitive usage, as the Tract

observes; and with regard to a difficulty felt by the anonymous writer of the few pages to which I have before alluded, it will be seen by an attentive reader, that when the Tract speaks of those General Councils which are gathered together *in the name of Christ*, it plainly does not mean those Councils which *profess* to be so gathered together, but which are *really* so; for as it implies afterwards, it is an important question and not an easy one ‘to determine—*what those conditions are which fulfil the notion of a gathering in the name of Christ.*’ p. 22.

The same writer has found a difficulty in the Tract’s explanation of the twenty-eighth Article, and considers that the Article ‘denies that the elements are altered at all.’ Controversy is not necessary on the word ‘altered,’ if he will bear in mind that the following paragraph was *added* in the XXXIX Articles, not having been in the forty-two, and must therefore be taken as explanatory of the former. ‘The Body of Christ is *given, taken, and eaten, &c.*’ the inference from which is obvious. Again, this paragraph about transubstantiation, as urged I think quite successfully in the Tract, is plainly of the same nature with the twenty-second Article, and directed in a general way against the existing superstitions of the time.

On the thirtieth Article (to which however I am not aware of objection having been as yet expressed) the Tract has not altogether satisfied me:

‘The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord’s Sacrament, by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.’

This certainly seems to contain a protest against the habit in the Roman Church of denying the cup to the laity, in the indiscriminate and unnecessary manner she has adopted for so many years ; so that if a person considered that point of discipline in her communion a legitimate or justifiable use of that power which the Church of course has, I should have doubts of his being able to sign the Article^b. It is very comforting to know, that it *is* a mere point of discipline which she might revoke at any moment: nor on the other hand does the Article seem to determine the question whether there may not be individual cases in which administration in one kind would be a pious procedure. Persons of infirm health (to whom the wine might be seriously prejudicial) afford one example; the ancient solitaries, to whom the Consecrated Bread was carried out, afford another ; a case where the danger of profanation from the Wine becoming corrupted, had the Cup also been brought them, is obvious¹. And indeed

^b At the same time it is certainly possible to take the first clause of the Article in a sense parallel to Art. XXXII, ‘non est denegandus, *as things are in our Church*, since (without judging others) we prefer having it according to Christ’s ordinance and commandment.’

¹ ‘As to the other part of the question,—whether the

this latter, recognized as it was in the Church in the ages which the Convocation of 1571 must certainly have contemplated when it speaks of the Ancient Fathers and Bishops, cannot be considered as condemned in the Articles which that Convocation sanctioned.

Before concluding, it may be as well to add a few words in explanation of such expressions as the following in the Tract; ‘in such a sense Scripture is not *on Anglican principles* a rule of faith,’ p. 11. the *Article* is ‘as it were pointing to the Catholic Church diffused throughout the world, which being but one cannot be mistaken,’ &c. p. 18. ‘Another of these conditions,’ (viz. of a General Council being Catholic) *the Article goes on to mention*, p. 22. ‘Therefore,’ *as the Article logically proceeds*,’ p. 64; and so a still stronger expression in Tract 82, (the same Tract from which a large quotation is made in Tract 90, p. 66.) ‘I look forward to success not by compelling others to take my view of the Articles, but by convincing them that *mine is the right one.*’ vol. iv. p. xxxi.

‘ancients did not in some private or extraordinary cases administer the Sacrament in one kind, we have no dispute with Bona.’ ‘Bona himself tells us that there are *some instances of the Communion being carried in both kinds to hermits and recluses.*’ ‘As to the other instances of the sick, or infants, or men in a journey, who communicate only in one kind, (if they were never so true, as we see *many* of them are false,) they are private and extraordinary cases,’ &c. Bingham, book xv. chap. 5.

Many persons seem to consider that such statements imply that persons, who subscribe the Articles in a different sense, do what in point of fact (of course dishonesty is not supposed to be imputed to them) they are not warranted in doing. And such further ways of speech as ‘*the Church of England teaches*’ certain doctrines, or ‘*we hold*’ against the Roman ‘*controversialist* such a point,’ are often considered to imply, that our formularies *as we have them* really are sufficient, if people would take them fairly, to witness this alleged truth. But these expressions need not be taken to imply so much; and *if* they need not be, it is important to state this, not only from the great desirableness that persons of opposite opinions should not consider their conduct to be spoken against when it is not, (the one great hope of our Church’s well doing at the present time and escape from her ‘*unhappy divisions,*’ is a loving and temperate consideration of the points at issue with as little as may be of reproach and imputation on either side,) but also from the light it throws on such parts of Mr. Newman’s Letter to Dr. Jelf, as the following: ‘*I should rejoice if the members of our Church were all of one mind, but they are not; and till they are, one can but submit to what is at present the will or rather the chastisement of Providence.*’ p. 29.

Such statements then as the preceding do not necessarily (I believe do not in the mind of the writer really) mean more than this: that if our

Church be looked upon *as a branch of the Church Catholic*, (in our sense of the words,) she must be considered to mean certain doctrines when she uses certain statements. It is not implied that our formularies *rule* it that we are a branch of the Church Catholic in this sense: many persons it is well known consider the English Church to be a Protestant Establishment, dating from the time of Edward VI.: and of these, some lay great stress on our being governed by Bishops; others consider the form of 'Church Government' to be a matter of very small importance: there is no necessity for denying that either class may subscribe our formularies, that is a point for their serious consideration, on which we are not called on to form an opinion^k. If they do so, they will receive them in a very different sense from that to which they give utterance in *our* ears. To *us* they come as the words of some old and revered friend, whom we have known long and well, and who has long

^f It is much to be wished that persons, who, from the apologetic air which to them the Tract may appear to wear, are led to consider it a sophistical attempt at explaining away our formal statements of doctrine, would consider the appearance which would be presented in their own case *if they placed on paper one after another the passages in our formularies* (whether Prayer Book or Articles,) which *give them difficulties*, without explicit allusion to the many parts which seem to them to be of an opposite tendency, and then put down in words the explanation of them in which they acquiesce, and by help of which they subscribe.

taught us high and holy lessons ; and if after such long experience we hear from him words which at first sound strangely, we interpret them *if possible* in accordance with his well-known spirit. If they absolutely refuse to be so explained, we recognise with sorrow that we have mistaken his character ; but in proportion to our experience of the preciousness of his former counsels, in proportion to our perception of the plain traces he still bears upon him of his former self, are we unwilling to believe that any of his expressions may not be so interpreted. This of course is Mr. Newman's meaning when he speaks of giving the Articles ' the most Catholic sense they will admit.' Tract, p. 80. In a word then, we raise no question about others who interpret our formularies by the spirit of Cranmer and Jewel, why are they found fault with who interpret them by St. Gregory and St. Augustin¹ ? or why are we to be suspected of lukewarmness in affection for our own Church, because, together with far higher feelings of the awfulness of privilege entrusted to it than others have, we

¹ If ever there were a point not determined by our Church, it is that she takes her date from the Reformation. The very name Protestant *is not once used in our whole Services or Articles.* The Prayer Book, no insignificant part of our formularies, dates for the most part from a far earlier period. The temporal rights of our Bishops, of our Chapters, the external framework of our Church, the divisions of our Dioceses, &c. &c. all call us back to St. Augustin rather than to Cranmer.

also add a far longer train of sympathies with her, and give her a far more extensive catalogue of saints?

One reason in addition may be mentioned, why to remain in our own Church, and by God's help endeavour to elevate its tone, cannot be looked on by the Catholic Christian as the cold performance of a duty, (though a plain duty of course it is,) but a labour of love. Many persons, who have been by God's grace led into what they deem the Truth, are most deeply sensible, that in the number of those who think otherwise, are still very many persons, so much their superiors in religious attainment, that the idea of even a comparison is most painful. Yet religious truth is the especial inheritance of such persons, who nevertheless, whether by the prepossessions of education, or the inadequate way in which that Truth has been brought before them, have hitherto failed to recognise God's mark upon it. Can there be a task more full of interest and hope, than in all possible ways, especially by the careful ordering of our own lives and conversations, to do what in us lies to set before such persons in a manner which may overcome their adverse impressions, that one image of the Catholic Church, which, could they but see it, is the real satisfaction for their restless cravings, and the fit reward for their patient continuance in well doing? yet such a task is exclusively ours as members of the *English* Church, and may well

add one to the many associations and bonds of love which binds us to that Holy Mother, through whom we received our new-birth. May we all have grace to labour worthily in the pious task of building her up in truth and purity, with loving tenderness indeed towards all branches of the Catholic Church, but with an especial and dutiful attachment to *her*.

W. G. W.

Balliol College.

APPENDIX.

AN additional quotation of Mr. Wilson's on purgatory from the Homilies, p. 24. escaped my notice in writing what goes before. In the Homily it *immediately follows* the quotation in the Tract: a few further extracts from the same passage, while they seem to require some little modification of the argument I had grounded on the previous passage, still on the whole will tend perhaps to shew more clearly the points I have insisted on: first, that the homilist was not writing with a determined and accurate view of his own any way; and secondly, that the general *drift* of the passage is to deny a 'place of repentance' for those who die in sin; though incidentally he takes up several positions the soundness of which we may well doubt. And let it never be forgotten, that the more inconsistency of general view we find in the Homilies, the stronger becomes the argument urged in the foregoing pages: viz. that the Reformers did not occupy themselves with the investigation of *principles* on these subjects, but with vigorous attacks on the existing corrupt creed of the mass of men^a.

' Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are any thing at all holpen by our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, *goeth straightways either to Heaven, or else to Hell*, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption. The

^a See p. 30.

only purgatory wherein we must trust *to be saved* is the death and blood of Christ, &c. This then is that purgatory wherein all Christian men put their whole trust and confidence, nothing doubting, but if they truly repent them of their sins, and die in *perfect* faith, that then they shall forthwith pass from death to life. If this kind of purgatory will not serve them, let them never hope to be released by men's prayers. He that *cannot be saved by faith in Christ's Blood*, how shall he look to be delivered by man's intercessions? But *we must take heed that we call upon this Advocate while we have space given us in this life, lest when we are once dead, there be no hope of salvation left unto us.* For as every man *sleepeth* with his own cause, so every man shall *rise again* with his own cause' [compare 'goeth *straightways* either to Heaven or to Hell' just before,] 'and look in what state he dieth, in the same state he shall be also judged, whether it be *to salvation* or *damnation*. Let us not *therefore* dream either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead,' &c.

In this short passage then the writer is in a formal contradiction with himself, on a subject not less closely connected with purgatory, than the question whether there is *any* intermediate state: he first states, and afterwards denies, that the soul goes *at once* to Heaven or Hell. The former statement being in positive contradiction to the doctrine of a *Day of Judgment*. He waives the question as to those who die in *imperfect* faith; he seems to speak of a purgatory, the believers in which *so far* renounce their trust in Christ's Atonement, &c. &c. At the same time the other words in Italics, especially the final 'therefore,' seem to shew what is all the time the current of his thoughts.

THE END.



